Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

*Total of

forms are submitted.

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

Approved for use through 06/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)		
		10233-701.201		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] June 6, 2008 by EFS	Application Number Filed 10/681,821 10/07/2003			
			on	First Named Inventor Anant V. HEGDE ET AL.
Signature				
	Art Unit Examiner			
Typed or printed name	370	02	J. STOKLOSA	
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.				
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.				
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.				
I am the	\sum) /	X	
			Dren	
applicant/inventor.			Signature	
assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.	J	James R. Shay		
(Form PTO/SB/96)			or printed name	
attorney or agent of record. Registration number 32,062	6	50.212.17	00	
			ephone number	
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.	J	une 6, 20	08:	
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34			Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.				

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

FILED VIA EFS ON JUNE 6, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 10233-701.201

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appl. No.

10/681,821

Confirmation No.:

6623

Applicant

Anant V. HEGDE et al.

Filing Date

October 7, 2003

Title

Vascular Assist Device and Methods

Group Art Unit:

3762

Examiner

Joseph A. STOKLOSA

Docket No.

10233-701.201

Customer No.

66854

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

MailStop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to the Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program, Appellants submit these Arguments in support of Applicants' Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, which is filed herewith, together with a Notice of Appeal from the Final Office Action dated April 30, 2008.

ARGUMENTS FOR REVIEW

In the Office Action dated April 30, 2008 (the "Final Office Action"), the Examiner acknowledged that claims 1-34, 36-39, 122-134 and 136-170 are pending and presented the following final rejection of the claims:

Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 26-27, 31, 36-39, 122, 136-139 and 143 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a) over Easterbrook US 6,238,334 (Final Office Action, p. 2);

Claims 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 28-30, 32-34, 140-142, 144-146, 159, 160, 169 and 170 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook (Final Office Action, p. 5);

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Walsh US 6,902,522 (Final Office Action, p. 9);

Claims 21, 128, 129 and 161-164 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Franchi US 6,030,335 (Final Office Action, p. 9);

Claims 123-127 and 130-134 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Freed US 5,169,379 (Final Office Action, p. 11); and

Claims 165-168 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easterbrook in view of Okuzumi US 6,587,734 (Final Office Action, p. 11).

The Final Office Action never states a ground of rejection for claims 22-25 and 147-158. Appellants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner clarify for purposes of this Appeal the status of these claims as being objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Alternatively, if the Examiner wishes to state grounds for rejection of these claims, Appellants respectfully request that the Examiner reopen prosecution to make the rejection(s).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2008

James R. Shay, Reg. No. 32,062

SHAY GLENN LLP 2755 Campus Drive, Suite 210 San Mateo, CA 94403 Telephone: 650.212.1700

Facsimile: 650.212.7562

CUSTOMER NO. 66854